



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,352	11/10/2003	Kuo Kuang Lin	USP2155T-CE	4631
30265	7590	04/27/2005	EXAMINER	
DAVID AND RAYMOND PATENT GROUP 1050 OAKDALE LANE ARCADIA, CA 91006			HAN, JASON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/705,352	Applicant(s) LIN, KUO KUANG	
	Examiner Jason M. Han	Art Unit 2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant has canceled Claims 1-20 and added Claims 21-37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133).

3. With regards to Claim 21, Loga discloses a ceiling fixture including:

- A ceiling supporting frame [Figure 5: adjacent and directly below (9)] adapted for securely mounting on a ceiling [Figure 5: (9)];
- A light source [Figure 5: (1)] supported by the ceiling support frame for producing light when the light source is operated;
- A light casing [Figure 5: (2)] mounted underneath the ceiling supporting frame, and further including:

Art Unit: 2875

- = A light dispersing housing [Figure 5: (2); Column 3, Lines 47-55] defining a main light chamber therewith, wherein the light source is disposed; and
- = A light enhancing frame having a surrounding wall [Figure 5: (6)] coaxially and outwardly extended from the light dispersing housing to the ceiling supporting frame, wherein the light enhancing frame has a light enhancing chamber [Figure 5: between (3) and (6)] which is formed within the surrounding wall and the ceiling supporting frame and is coaxially positioned above the main light chamber, and at least a light enhancing window [Figure 5: (6)] communicating said light enhancing chamber with an exterior of said light enhancing frame, whereby when the light source is operated, a portion of the light directly projects to the light dispersing housing within the main light chamber for illumination [Column 3, Lines 47-55] and a portion of said light radially and upwardly diffuses towards the light enhancing chamber such that a light intensity within the main light chamber is higher than a light intensity within the light enhancing chamber for providing an added light effect of the ceiling fixture at the light enhancing window [Column 5, Lines 22-45].

4. With regards to Claim 24, Loga discloses the light enhancing frame [Figure 5: (6)] having an upper surrounding edge coaxially extended from the ceiling supporting frame and a lower surrounding edge coaxially coupling with the light dispersing housing

Art Unit: 2875

[Figure 5: (2)], wherein the light enhancing frame has a diameter gradually reducing from the upper surrounding edge to the lower surrounding edge such that the surrounding wall of the light enhancing frame inclines outwardly from the light dispersing housing to the ceiling supporting frame to form the light enhancing chamber.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) as applied to Claim 21 above, and further in view of Tsuji et al. (U.S. Patent 6450658).

Loga discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but does not specifically teach the light enhancing window being a through groove formed on the surrounding wall of the light enhancing frame for communicating the light enhancing chamber with the exterior of the light enhancing frame such that when the portion of light diffuses to the light enhancing chamber, the portion of light dispenses to the exterior of said light casing through said through groove (re: Claim 22), nor teaches the light casing providing a softening layer on an inner side of the surrounding wall of the light enhancing frame to cover the light enhancing window for softening the portion of light dispersing therethrough (re: Claim 23).

Tsuji teaches a ceiling light assembly wherein an upper shaped bowl housing [Figure 2: (18)] has an annular array of openings [Figure 2: (26)] in which are mounted translucent windows [Figure 2: (27)], whereby light radiating from an upper assembly passes through. Tsuji further teaches the array of windows [see Abstract] having though grooves [Figure 2: (26)] for radially dispensing and providing a benefit of diffusing the light, which is functionally equivalent to softening a light [Column 3, Lines 29-32].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the light enhancing frame of Loga to incorporate the translucent windows of Tsuji in order to provide different illuminating orientations and an aesthetic appeal to consumers and light enthusiasts.

6. With regard to Claims 25-26, Loga in view of Tsuji discloses the claimed invention as cited above. In addition, Loga discloses the light enhancing frame [Figure 5: (6)] having an upper surrounding edge coaxially extended from the ceiling supporting frame and a lower surrounding edge coaxially coupling with the light dispersing housing [Figure 5: (2)], wherein the light enhancing frame has a diameter gradually reducing from the upper surrounding edge to the lower surrounding edge such that the surrounding wall of the light enhancing frame inclines outwardly from the light dispersing housing to the ceiling supporting frame to form the light enhancing chamber.

7. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Tsuji et al. (U.S. Patent 6450658) as

Art Unit: 2875

applied to Claims 24, 25, and 26, respectively above, and further in view of Hsu (U.S. 6623138).

Loga in view of Tsuji discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but neither specifically teaches the lower surrounding edge of the light enhancing frame forming a retaining rim substantially biasing against a circumferential edge of the light dispensing housing, wherein the retaining rim of the light enhancing frame is coaxially and inwardly extended between the main light chamber and the light enhancing chamber for controlling said light passing from the main light chamber towards the light enhancing chamber.

Hsu teaches a lower surrounding edge of a frame [Figure 3: (31)] forming a retaining rim substantially biasing against a circumferential edge of a light dispersing housing [Figure 3: (33)], wherein the retaining rim is coaxially and inwardly extended between a main light chamber [Figure 3: (32)] and another chamber [Figure 3: (22)].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Tsuji to incorporate the retaining rim of Hsu in order to simplify assembly/disassembly of said fixture for replacement or repairs. In addition, it is obvious that one would want to set the retaining rim at appropriate settings (i.e., heights/widths) according to the desired optical effect on the illumination.

8. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Tsuji et al. (U.S. Patent 6450658) as

Art Unit: 2875

applied to Claims 23 and 26, respectively above, and further in view of McCarthy et al. (U.S. Patent 6042251).

Loga in view of Tsuji discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but neither specifically teaches, in combination, the ceiling supporting frame including a ceiling panel supporting the light source thereunder for securely mounting on the ceiling, and a heat insulating layer provided on the ceiling panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling, wherein the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source towards the light enhancing chamber.

McCarthy teaches a light fixture including a ceiling supporting frame, wherein a ceiling panel supports a light source thereunder for mounting on the ceiling, a heat insulating layer provided on said panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling [Column 2, Lines 51-52], and whereby the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source away from the ceiling [Column 3, Lines 9-11].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Tsuji to incorporate the ceiling panel of McCarthy to provide safety from a potential fire hazard, as well as, efficiency in utilizing the illumination away from the ceiling.

9. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Tsuji et al. (U.S. Patent 6450658) and Hsu (U.S.

Art Unit: 2875

6623138) as applied to Claim 29, respectively above, and further in view of McCarthy et al. (U.S. Patent 6042251).

Loga in view of Tsuji and Hsu discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but none specifically teaches, in combination, the ceiling supporting frame including a ceiling panel supporting the light source thereunder for securely mounting on the ceiling, and a heat insulating layer provided on the ceiling panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling, wherein the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source towards the light enhancing chamber.

McCarthy teaches a light fixture including a ceiling supporting frame, wherein a ceiling panel supports a light source thereunder for mounting on the ceiling, a heat insulating layer provided on said panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling [Column 2, Lines 51-52], and whereby the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source away from the ceiling [Column 3, Lines 9-11].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Tsuji and Hsu to incorporate the ceiling panel of McCarthy to provide safety from a potential fire hazard, as well as, efficiency in utilizing the illumination away from the ceiling.

10. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) as applied to Claim 21 above, and further in view of Jaffari et al. (U.S. Patent 6478454).

Art Unit: 2875

11. With regards to Claim 33, Loga discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but does not specifically teach the light enhancing window being a light gap between an upper surrounding edge of the light enhancing frame and the ceiling supporting frame for communicating the light enhancing chamber with the exterior of the light enhancing frame such that when said portion of light diffuses to the light enhancing chamber, the portion of light dispenses to the exterior of the light casing through said light gap.

Jaffari teaches an adjustable uplight luminaire with an adjustable reflector, wherein an upper section has light gaps/grooves [Figures 1, 2, 6: (40, 45)] through which light passes through.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the light enhancing frame of Loga to incorporate the upper section with light gaps/grooves of Jaffari, in order to provide illumination outwardly upwardly, as well as a means for heat dissipation through the openings.

12. With regards to Claim 34, Loga in view of Jaffari discloses the claimed invention as cited above. In addition, Loga discloses the light enhancing frame [Figure 5: (6)] having an upper surrounding edge coaxially extended from the ceiling supporting frame and a lower surrounding edge coaxially coupling with the light dispersing housing [Figure 5: (2)], wherein the light enhancing frame has a diameter gradually reducing from the upper surrounding edge to the lower surrounding edge such that the surrounding wall of the light enhancing frame inclines outwardly from the light dispersing housing to the ceiling supporting frame to form the light enhancing chamber.

13. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Jaffari et al. (U.S. Patent 6478454) as applied to Claim 34 above, and further in view of Hsu (U.S. 6623138).

Loga in view of Jaffari discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but neither specifically teaches the lower surrounding edge of the light enhancing frame forming a retaining rim substantially biasing against a circumferential edge of the light dispensing housing, wherein the retaining rim of the light enhancing frame is coaxially and inwardly extended between the main light chamber and the light enhancing chamber for controlling said light passing from the main light chamber towards the light enhancing chamber.

Hsu teaches a lower surrounding edge of a frame [Figure 3: (31)] forming a retaining rim substantially biasing against a circumferential edge of a light dispersing housing [Figure 3: (33)], wherein the retaining rim is coaxially and inwardly extended between a main light chamber [Figure 3: (32)] and another chamber [Figure 3: (22)].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Jaffari to incorporate the retaining rim of Hsu in order to simplify assembly/disassembly of said fixture for replacement or repairs. In addition, it is obvious that one would want to set the retaining rim at appropriate settings (i.e., heights/widths) according to the desired optical effect on the illumination.

14. Claim 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Jaffari et al. (U.S. Patent 6478454) as applied to Claim 33 above, and further in view of McCarthy et al. (U.S. Patent 6042251).

Loga in view of Jaffari discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but neither specifically teaches, in combination, the ceiling supporting frame including a ceiling panel supporting the light source thereunder for securely mounting on the ceiling, and a heat insulating layer provided on the ceiling panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling, wherein the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source towards the light enhancing chamber.

McCarthy teaches a light fixture including a ceiling supporting frame, wherein a ceiling panel supports a light source thereunder for mounting on the ceiling, a heat insulating layer provided on said panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling [Column 2, Lines 51-52], and whereby the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source away from the ceiling [Column 3, Lines 9-11].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Jaffari to incorporate the ceiling panel of McCarthy to provide safety from a potential fire hazard, as well as, efficiency in utilizing the illumination away from the ceiling.

15. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loga et al. (U.S. Patent 6746133) in view of Jaffari et al. (U.S. Patent 6478454) and Hsu (U.S.

6623138) as applied to Claim 35, respectively above, and further in view of McCarthy et al. (U.S. Patent 6042251).

Loga in view of Jaffari and Hsu discloses the claimed invention as cited above, but none specifically teaches, in combination, the ceiling supporting frame including a ceiling panel supporting the light source thereunder for securely mounting on the ceiling, and a heat insulating layer provided on the ceiling panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling, wherein the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source towards the light enhancing chamber.

McCarthy teaches a light fixture including a ceiling supporting frame, wherein a ceiling panel supports a light source thereunder for mounting on the ceiling, a heat insulating layer provided on said panel for blocking heat from the light source towards the ceiling [Column 2, Lines 51-52], and whereby the ceiling panel has a bottom light reflective surface for substantially reflecting the light from the light source away from the ceiling [Column 3, Lines 9-11].

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ceiling fixture of Loga in view of Jaffari and Hsu to incorporate the ceiling panel of McCarthy to provide safety from a potential fire hazard, as well as, efficiency in utilizing the illumination away from the ceiling.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2875

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Han whose telephone number is (571) 272-2207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2875

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JMH (4/22/2005)


Stephen Husar
Primary Examiner